

REMARKS

In the Official Action of January 27, 2003, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kessler et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,864), claims 1, 3, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Danielson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,710), and claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Krock* (U.S. Patent No. 3,600,917). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kessler et al.* or *Danielson et al.* or *Krock*, claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kessler et al.* or *Danielson et al.* in view of Official Notice, and claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Danielson et al.* in view of *Krock* or *Kessler et al.*

37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a); Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner argues that the claim language requiring the other of said guide ridge and said concave groove is formed on the other of said rear surface and said inside surface must be shown or the features canceled from claim 4.

Applicants have amended claim 4. This amendment is clarifying only and does not limit the subject matter claimed. Applicants respectfully submit that every feature of the claimed invention is shown in the drawings. In particular, the guide ridge (18) is

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

shown in FIG. 3, and the concave groove (26) is shown in FIG. 8. Therefore, Applicants submit that this objection has been overcome.

35 U.S.C. § 112: Claims 1-7

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 as being indefinite.

Claim 6 has been cancelled herein and the limitation has been revised and incorporated into claim 1. Further, claims 1, 3, and 4 have been amended so as to overcome the Examiner's rejection. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are sufficiently definite.

35 U.S.C. § 102: Claims 1, 3, 6, and 7

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kessler et al.*, claims 1, 3, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Danielson et al.*, and claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Krock*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended claim 1 recites, "a small article holding pocket formed on said small article mounting plate of said plug-in body, wherein said small article holding pocket is capable of receiving and positively holding at least a portion of a small article."

None of *Kessler et al.*, *Danielson et al.*, or *Krock*, on the other hand, either disclose or suggest "a small article holding pocket formed on said small article mounting plate of said plug-in body, wherein said small article holding pocket is capable of receiving and positively holding at least a portion of a small article." Specifically, none

of the "holding pockets" argued by the Examiner as disclosed in *Kessler et al.*, *Danielson et al.*, or *Krock* are capable of receiving and positively holding at least a portion of a small article. To the contrary, each of these patents discloses an open receiving area that will not positively hold a small article. Accordingly, for at least the reasons described above, independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over *Kessler et al.*, *Danielson et al.*, and *Krock*. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Dependent claims 3, 6 and 7 are also allowable at least for the reasons above regarding independent claim 1 and by virtue of their dependency upon independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

35 U.S.C. § 103: Claims 2, 4, 5, and 7

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kessler et al.*, or *Danielson et al.*, or *Krock*, claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kessler et al.*, or *Danielson et al.*, in view of Official Notice, and claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Danielson et al.* in view of *Krock* or *Kessler et al.*

Each of claims 2, 4, 5, and 7 depend from independent claim 1. According, for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1, these claims are likewise allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 28, 2003

By: 

Barry D. Biddle
Reg. No. 44,033

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com